

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 6, 2006, the Examiner maintained the objection of claims 2 and 12 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form, because the Examiner stated those claims contradict the independent claims from which they depend.

Additionally, claims 2-9 and 13-19 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for the same reasons noted above, as well as blocking antecedent basis for the plural term "memory areas".

Applicants note with appreciation the telephone interview courteously afforded the undersigned counsel for the Applicants on April 3, 2006. In this telephone interview, the Examiner explained that his basis for considering claims 2 and 12 to respectively contradict claims 1 and 11 is that independent claims 1 and 11 each affirmatively require that a communication to the data center be established, but dependent claims 2 and 12 state that the establishment of such a communication is conditional on a certain event (entry of a load instruction) occurring. The Examiner stated dependent claims 2 and 12, therefore, encompass the possibility of establishment of the communication not occurring, if the aforementioned event has not occurred. The Examiner stated this possibility contradicts the language of the independent claims, which affirmatively requires that the communication be established.

In response, each of claims 2 and 12 has been amended to cancel the language that the Examiner considers to contradict the language of the independent claims. It was agreed at the interview that this would not alter the allowability of any of the claims over the teachings of the prior art.

Editorial amendments also were proposed and discussed at the telephone interview to respond to the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph. Those further amendments have been made herein in claims 2 and 12, to use the plural term "areas" throughout, so that proper antecedent basis is provided.


It was agreed at the interview that these changes would overcome the objection and rejection in the Office Action, and would not raise any new issues requiring further searching or consideration, and thus would be entered at this stage of prosecution, after the final rejection.

In view of the indicated allowability of all claims of the application over the teachings of the prior art of record, all claims of the application are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

One final administrative item, however, must be reviewed when the application is passed to issue. In the first Office Action dated March 10, 2002, Box 13c was checked, indicating that Applicants foreign priority document had not been received. In Applicants' response to that Office Action (Amendment "A", filed August 6, 2002), at page 3, Applicants provided evidentiary proof that the priority document had been sent to the Patent Office and received at the Patent Office, and requested the Examiner to review the file and to indicate receipt of the priority document. Evidentiary proof was attached to Amendment "A" showing that the priority document

was sent to the Patent Office and received at the Patent Office. In the subsequent Office Actions, no acknowledgement of receipt of the priority document was indicated. Applicants therefore respectfully request that such an indication be made in the Notice of Allowability.

Submitted by,



(Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4523122.1